

CONSTITUTIONAL CASE LAW

Bennett v. Boggs, 1 Baldw 60. "Statutes that violate the plain and obvious principles of common right and common reason are null and void". Would we not say that these judicial decisions are straight to the point --that there is no lawful method for government to put restrictions or limitations on rights belonging to the people? Other cases are even more straight forward: "The assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of practice."

Davis v. Wechsler , 263 US 22, 24 "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them."

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 US 436, 491. "The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."

Miller v. US, 230 F 486, 489. "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights "

Sherer v. Cullen , 481 F 946. We could go on, quoting court decision after court decision, however, the Constitution itself answers our question ♦ Can a government legally put restrictions on the rights of the American people at anytime, for any reason? The answer is found in Article Six of the U.S. Constitution: **Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 426, 491; 86 S. Ct. 1603** "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making' or legislation which would abrogate them."

Norton v. Shelby County , 118 U.S. 425 p. 442

"An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

Sherar v. Cullen , 481 F. 2d 946 (1973)

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of constitutional rights."

Simmons v. United States , 390 U.S. 377 (1968)

"The claim and exercise of a Constitution right cannot be converted into a crime"... "a denial of them would be a denial of due process of law".

Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)

Note: Any judge who does not comply with his oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged in acts of treason.

The U.S. Supreme Court has stated that "no state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it". See also *In Re Sawyer, 124 U.S. 200 (188)*; *U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S. Ct. 471, 66 L. Ed. 2d 392, 406 (1980)*; *Cohens v. Virginia*.